

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

**IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS*
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED
AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE
OR ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS
CORP., AND THE OTHER APPLICANTS LISTED ON EXHIBIT "A"**

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE RESPONDING PARTY,
THE AD HOC COMMITTEE**

March 22, 2010

GOODMANS LLP

Suite 2400, 250 Yonge Street
Toronto, ON M5B 2M6

Benjamin Zarnett LSUC#: 17247M
Robert J. Chadwick LSUC#: 35165K
Logan Willis LSUC#: 53894K

Tel: 416-979-2211

Fax: 416-979-1234

Lawyers for Ad Hoc Committee

INDEX

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

**IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS*
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED
AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE
OR ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS
CORP., AND THE OTHER APPLICANTS LISTED ON EXHIBIT "A"**

INDEX

1. *Re Canwest Global Communications Corp.* (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J.)
2. *Re Canwest Global Communications Corp.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 7882 (Ont. S.C.J.)
3. *BDC Venture Capital Inc. v. National Convergence Inc.*, 2009 ONCA 665
4. *Skyepharmaceutical plc v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.*, [2000] 47 O.R. (3d) 234 (C.A.)
5. *Re Pacific National Lease Holding Corp.* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 265 (B.C.C.A.)
6. *Algoma Steel Inc. v. Union Gas Limited* (2003), 63 O.R. (3d) 78 (C.A.)
7. *Resurgence Asset Management LLC v. Canadian Airlines Corp.*, 2000 ABCA 149
8. *Re Stelco* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (C.A.)

TAB 1

Case Name:

Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)

**IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors Arrangement
Act, R.S.C. 1985, C-36. as amended
AND IN THE MATTER OF a Proposed Plan of Compromise or
Arrangement of Canwest Global Communications Corp. and
the other applicants listed on schedule "A"**

[Editor's note:

Schedule "A" was not attached to the copy received by
LexisNexis Canada and therefore is not included in the
judgment.]

[2009] O.J. No. 4286

59 C.B.R. (5th) 72

2009 CanLII 55114

2009 CarswellOnt 6184

Court File No. CV-09-8241-OOCL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

S.E. Pepall J.

October 13, 2009.

(60 paras.)

*Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters --
Application of Act -- Affiliated debtor companies -- Application by Canwest Global for relief under
the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to have the stay of proceedings and other
provisions extend to several partnerships allowed -- Applicant Canwest Global owned CMI which
was insolvent -- CMI Entities and Ad Hoc Committee of noteholders had agreed on terms of a going
concern recapitalization transaction -- Stay under Act was extended to several partnerships that*

were intertwined with the applicants' ongoing operations -- DIP and administration charges approved -- Applicants were also permitted to pay pre-filing liabilities to their critical suppliers.

Application by Canwest Global for relief under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to have the stay of proceedings and other provisions extend to several partnerships. The applicants were affiliated debtor companies with total claims against them exceeding \$5 million. The partnerships were intertwined with the applicants' ongoing operations. Canwest was a leading Canadian media company. Canwest Global owned 100 per cent of CMI. CMI had direct or indirect ownership interests in all of the other CMI Entities. The CMI Entities generated the majority of their revenue from the sale of advertising. Fuelled by a deteriorating economic environment, they experienced a decline in their advertising revenues. This caused problems with cash flow and circumstances were exacerbated by their high fixed operating costs. CMI breached certain of the financial covenants in its secured credit facility. The stay of proceedings was sought so as to allow the CMI Entities to proceed to develop a plan of arrangement or compromise to implement a consensual pre-packaged recapitalization transaction. The CMI Entities and an Ad Hoc Committee of noteholders had agreed on the terms of a going concern recapitalization transaction which was intended to form the basis of the plan. The applicants anticipated that a substantial number of the businesses operated by the CMI Entities would continue as going concerns thereby preserving enterprise value for stakeholders and maintaining employment for as many as possible. Certain steps designed to implement the recapitalization transaction had already been taken prior to the commencement of these proceedings.

HELD: Application allowed. The CMI Entities were unable to satisfy their debts as they come due and were insolvent. Absent these proceedings, the applicants would lack liquidity and would be unable to continue as going concerns. It was just and convenient to grant the relief requested with respect to the partnerships. The operations and obligations of the partnerships were so intertwined with those of the applicants that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted. The DIP charge for up to \$100 million was appropriate and required having regard to the debtors' cash-flow statement. The administration charge was also approved. Notice had been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge, the amount was appropriate, and the charge should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries. The applicants were also permitted to pay pre-filing liabilities to their critical suppliers.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. c. 36, s. 11, s. 11(2), s. 11.2, s. 11.2(1), s. 11.52

Counsel:

Lyndon Barnes, Edward Sellers and Jeremy Dacks, for the Applicants.

Alan Merskey, for the Special Committee of the Board of Directors.

David Byers and Maria Konyukhova,> for the Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Benjamin Zarnett and Robert Chadwick, for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

Edmond Lamek, for the Asper Family.

Peter H. Griffin and Peter J. Osborne, for the Management Directors and Royal Bank of Canada.

Hilary Clarke, for Bank of Nova Scotia,

Steve Weisz, for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

REASONS FOR DECISION

S.E. PEPALL J.:--

Relief Requested

1 Canwest Global Communications Corp. ("Canwest Global"), its principal operating subsidiary, Canwest Media Inc. ("CMI"), and the other applicants listed on Schedule "A" of the Notice of Application apply for relief pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.¹ The applicants also seek to have the stay of proceedings and other provisions extend to the following partnerships: Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLP"), Fox Sports World Canada Partnership and The National Post Company/La Publication National Post ("The National Post Company"). The businesses operated by the applicants and the aforementioned partnerships include (i) Canwest's free-to-air television broadcast business (ie. the Global Television Network stations); (ii) certain subscription-based specialty television channels that are wholly owned and operated by CTLP; and (iii) the National Post.

2 The Canwest Global enterprise as a whole includes the applicants, the partnerships and Canwest Global's other subsidiaries that are not applicants. The term Canwest will be used to refer to the entire enterprise. The term CMI Entities will be used to refer to the applicants and the three aforementioned partnerships. The following entities are not applicants nor is a stay sought in respect of any of them: the entities in Canwest's newspaper publishing and digital media business in Canada (other than the National Post Company) namely the Canwest Limited Partnership, Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Canwest Books Inc., and Canwest (Canada) Inc.; the Canadian subscription based specialty television channels acquired from Alliance Atlantis Communications Inc. in August, 2007 which are held jointly with Goldman Sachs Capital Partners

and operated by CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries; and subscription-based specialty television channels which are not wholly owned by CTLP.

3 No one appearing opposed the relief requested.

Background Facts

4 Canwest is a leading Canadian media company with interests in twelve free-to-air television stations comprising the Global Television Network, subscription-based specialty television channels and newspaper publishing and digital media operations.

5 As of October 1, 2009, Canwest employed the full time equivalent of approximately 7,400 employees around the world. Of that number, the full time equivalent of approximately 1,700 are employed by the CMI Entities, the vast majority of whom work in Canada and 850 of whom work in Ontario.

6 Canwest Global owns 100% of CMI. CMI has direct or indirect ownership interests in all of the other CMI Entities. Ontario is the chief place of business of the CMI Entities.

7 Canwest Global is a public company continued under the *Canada Business Corporations Act*². It has authorized capital consisting of an unlimited number of preference shares, multiple voting shares, subordinate voting shares, and non-voting shares. It is a "constrained-share company" which means that at least 66 2/3% of its voting shares must be beneficially owned by Canadians. The Asper family built the Canwest enterprise and family members hold various classes of shares. In April and May, 2009, corporate decision making was consolidated and streamlined.

8 The CMI Entities generate the majority of their revenue from the sale of advertising (approximately 77% on a consolidated basis). Fuelled by a deteriorating economic environment in Canada and elsewhere, in 2008 and 2009, they experienced a decline in their advertising revenues. This caused problems with cash flow and circumstances were exacerbated by their high fixed operating costs. In response to these conditions, the CMI Entities took steps to improve cash flow and to strengthen their balance sheets. They commenced workforce reductions and cost saving measures, sold certain interests and assets, and engaged in discussions with the CRTC and the Federal government on issues of concern.

9 Economic conditions did not improve nor did the financial circumstances of the CMI Entities. They experienced significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and trade creditors, a further reduction of advertising commitments, demands for reduced credit terms by newsprint and printing suppliers, and restrictions on or cancellation of credit cards for certain employees.

10 In February, 2009, CMI breached certain of the financial covenants in its secured credit facility. It subsequently received waivers of the borrowing conditions on six occasions. On March 15, 2009, it failed to make an interest payment of US\$30.4 million due on 8% senior subordinated

notes. CMI entered into negotiations with an ad hoc committee of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders holding approximately 72% of the notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee"). An agreement was reached wherein CMI and its subsidiary CTLP agreed to issue US\$105 million in 12% secured notes to members of the Ad Hoc Committee. At the same time, CMI entered into an agreement with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT") in which CIT agreed to provide a senior secured revolving asset based loan facility of up to \$75 million. CMI used the funds generated for operations and to repay amounts owing on the senior credit facility with a syndicate of lenders of which the Bank of Nova Scotia was the administrative agent. These funds were also used to settle related swap obligations.

11 Canwest Global reports its financial results on a consolidated basis. As at May 31, 2009, it had total consolidated assets with a net book value of \$4.855 billion and total consolidated liabilities of \$5.846 billion. The subsidiaries of Canwest Global that are not applicants or partnerships in this proceeding had short and long term debt totalling \$2.742 billion as at May 31, 2009 and the CMI Entities had indebtedness of approximately \$954 million. For the 9 months ended May 31, 2009, Canwest Global's consolidated revenues decreased by \$272 million or 11% compared to the same period in 2008. In addition, operating income before amortization decreased by \$253 million or 47%. It reported a consolidated net loss of \$1.578 billion compared to \$22 million for the same period in 2008. CMI reported that revenues for the Canadian television operations decreased by \$8 million or 4% in the third quarter of 2009 and operating profit was \$21 million compared to \$39 million in the same period in 2008.

12 The board of directors of Canwest Global struck a special committee of the board ("the Special Committee") with a mandate to explore and consider strategic alternatives in order to maximize value. That committee appointed Thomas Strike, who is the President, Corporate Development and Strategy Implementation of Canwest Global, as Recapitalization Officer and retained Hap Stephen, who is the Chairman and CEO of Stonecrest Capital Inc., as a Restructuring Advisor ("CRA").

13 On September 15, 2009, CMI failed to pay US\$30.4 million in interest payments due on the 8% senior subordinated notes.

14 On September 22, 2009, the board of directors of Canwest Global authorized the sale of all of the shares of Ten Network Holdings Limited (Australia) ("Ten Holdings") held by its subsidiary, Canwest Mediaworks Ireland Holdings ("CMIH"). Prior to the sale, the CMI Entities had consolidated indebtedness totalling US\$939.9 million pursuant to three facilities. CMI had issued 8% unsecured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US\$761,054,211. They were guaranteed by all of the CMI Entities except Canwest Global, and 30109, LLC. CMI had also issued 12% secured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US\$94 million. They were guaranteed by the CMI Entities. Amongst others, Canwest's subsidiary, CMIH, was a guarantor of both of these facilities. The 12% notes were secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP and the guarantors. In addition, pursuant to a credit agreement dated May 22, 2009 and subsequently

amended, CMI has a senior secured revolving asset-based loan facility in the maximum amount of \$75 million with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT"). Prior to the sale, the debt amounted to \$23.4 million not including certain letters of credit. The facility is guaranteed by CTLP, CMIH and others and secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP, CMIH and other guarantors. Significant terms of the credit agreement are described in paragraph 37 of the proposed Monitor's report. Upon a CCAA filing by CMI and commencement of proceedings under Chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Code, the CIT facility converts into a DIP financing arrangement and increases to a maximum of \$100 million.

15 Consents from a majority of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders were necessary to allow the sale of the Ten Holdings shares. A Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement was entered into by CMI, CMIH, certain consenting noteholders and others wherein CMIH was allowed to lend the proceeds of sale to CMI.

16 The sale of CMIH's interest in Ten Holdings was settled on October 1, 2009. Gross proceeds of approximately \$634 million were realized. The proceeds were applied to fund general liquidity and operating costs of CMI, pay all amounts owing under the 12% secured notes and all amounts outstanding under the CIT facility except for certain letters of credit in an aggregate face amount of \$10.7 million. In addition, a portion of the proceeds was used to reduce the amount outstanding with respect to the 8% senior subordinated notes leaving an outstanding indebtedness thereunder of US\$393.25 million.

17 In consideration for the loan provided by CMIH to CMI, CMI issued a secured intercompany note in favour of CMIH in the principal amount of \$187.3 million and an unsecured promissory note in the principal amount of \$430.6 million. The secured note is subordinated to the CIT facility and is secured by a first ranking charge on the property of CMI and the guarantors. The payment of all amounts owing under the unsecured promissory note are subordinated and postponed in favour of amounts owing under the CIT facility. Canwest Global, CTLP and others have guaranteed the notes. It is contemplated that the debt that is the subject matter of the unsecured note will be compromised.

18 Without the funds advanced under the intercompany notes, the CMI Entities would be unable to meet their liabilities as they come due. The consent of the noteholders to the use of the Ten Holdings proceeds was predicated on the CMI Entities making this application for an Initial Order under the CCAA. Failure to do so and to take certain other steps constitute an event of default under the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement, the CIT facility and other agreements. The CMI Entities have insufficient funds to satisfy their obligations including those under the intercompany notes and the 8% senior subordinated notes.

19 The stay of proceedings under the CCAA is sought so as to allow the CMI Entities to proceed to develop a plan of arrangement or compromise to implement a consensual "pre-packaged" recapitalization transaction. The CMI Entities and the Ad Hoc Committee of noteholders have

agreed on the terms of a going concern recapitalization transaction which is intended to form the basis of the plan. The terms are reflected in a support agreement and term sheet. The recapitalization transaction contemplates amongst other things, a significant reduction of debt and a debt for equity restructuring. The applicants anticipate that a substantial number of the businesses operated by the CMI Entities will continue as going concerns thereby preserving enterprise value for stakeholders and maintaining employment for as many as possible. As mentioned, certain steps designed to implement the recapitalization transaction have already been taken prior to the commencement of these proceedings.

20 CMI has agreed to maintain not more than \$2.5 million as cash collateral in a deposit account with the Bank of Nova Scotia to secure cash management obligations owed to BNS. BNS holds first ranking security against those funds and no court ordered charge attaches to the funds in the account.

21 The CMI Entities maintain eleven defined benefit pension plans and four defined contribution pension plans. There is an aggregate solvency deficiency of \$13.3 million as at the last valuation date and a wind up deficiency of \$32.8 million. There are twelve television collective agreements eleven of which are negotiated with the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada. The Canadian Union of Public Employees negotiated the twelfth television collective agreement. It expires on December 31, 2010. The other collective agreements are in expired status. None of the approximately 250 employees of the National Post Company are unionized. The CMI Entities propose to honour their payroll obligations to their employees, including all pre-filing wages and employee benefits outstanding as at the date of the commencement of the CCAA proceedings and payments in connection with their pension obligations.

Proposed Monitor

22 The applicants propose that FTI Consulting Canada Inc. serve as the Monitor in these proceedings. It is clearly qualified to act and has provided the Court with its consent to act. Neither FTI nor any of its representatives have served in any of the capacities prohibited by section of the amendments to the CCAA.

Proposed Order

23 I have reviewed in some detail the history that preceded this application. It culminated in the presentation of the within application and proposed order. Having reviewed the materials and heard submissions, I was satisfied that the relief requested should be granted.

24 This case involves a consideration of the amendments to the CCAA that were proclaimed in force on September 18, 2009. While these were long awaited, in many instances they reflect practices and principles that have been adopted by insolvency practitioners and developed in the jurisprudence and academic writings on the subject of the CCAA. In no way do the amendments change or detract from the underlying purpose of the CCAA, namely to provide debtor companies

with the opportunity to extract themselves from financial difficulties notwithstanding insolvency and to reorganize their affairs for the benefit of stakeholders. In my view, the amendments should be interpreted and applied with that objective in mind.

(a) Threshold Issues

25 Firstly, the applicants qualify as debtor companies under the CCAA. Their chief place of business is in Ontario. The applicants are affiliated debtor companies with total claims against them exceeding \$5 million. The CMI Entities are in default of their obligations. CMI does not have the necessary liquidity to make an interest payment in the amount of US\$30.4 million that was due on September 15, 2009 and none of the other CMI Entities who are all guarantors are able to make such a payment either. The assets of the CMI Entities are insufficient to discharge all of the liabilities. The CMI Entities are unable to satisfy their debts as they come due and they are insolvent. They are insolvent both under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*³ definition and under the more expansive definition of insolvency used in *Re Stelco*⁴. Absent these CCAA proceedings, the applicants would lack liquidity and would be unable to continue as going concerns. The CMI Entities have acknowledged their insolvency in the affidavit filed in support of the application.

26 Secondly, the required statement of projected cash-flow and other financial documents required under section 11(2) of the CCAA have been filed.

(b) Stay of Proceedings

27 Under section 11 of the CCAA, the Court has broad jurisdiction to grant a stay of proceedings and to give a debtor company a chance to develop a plan of compromise or arrangement. In my view, given the facts outlined, a stay is necessary to create stability and to allow the CMI Entities to pursue their restructuring.

(b) Partnerships and Foreign Subsidiaries

28 The applicants seek to extend the stay of proceedings and other relief to the aforementioned partnerships. The partnerships are intertwined with the applicants' ongoing operations. They own the National Post daily newspaper and Canadian free-to-air television assets and certain of its specialty television channels and some other television assets. These businesses constitute a significant portion of the overall enterprise value of the CMI Entities. The partnerships are also guarantors of the 8% senior subordinated notes.

29 While the CCAA definition of a company does not include a partnership or limited partnership, courts have repeatedly exercised their inherent jurisdiction to extend the scope of CCAA proceedings to encompass them. See for example *Re Lehndorff General Partners Ltd.*⁵; *Re Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc.*⁶; and *Re Calpine Canada Energy Ltd.*⁷. In this case, the partnerships carry on operations that are integral and closely interrelated to the business of the applicants. The operations and obligations of the partnerships are so intertwined with those of the

applicants that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted. In my view, it is just and convenient to grant the relief requested with respect to the partnerships.

30 Certain applicants are foreign subsidiaries of CMI. Each is a guarantor under the 8% senior subordinated notes, the CIT credit agreement (and therefore the DIP facility), the intercompany notes and is party to the support agreement and the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement. If the stay of proceedings was not extended to these entities, creditors could seek to enforce their guarantees. I am persuaded that the foreign subsidiary applicants as that term is defined in the affidavit filed are debtor companies within the meaning of section 2 of the CCAA and that I have jurisdiction and ought to grant the order requested as it relates to them. In this regard, I note that they are insolvent and each holds assets in Ontario in that they each maintain funds on deposit at the Bank of Nova Scotia in Toronto. See in this regard *Re Cadillac Fairview*⁸ and *Re Global Light Telecommunications Ltd.*⁹

(c) DIP Financing

31 Turning to the DIP financing, the premise underlying approval of DIP financing is that it is a benefit to all stakeholders as it allows the debtors to protect going-concern value while they attempt to devise a plan acceptable to creditors. While in the past, courts relied on inherent jurisdiction to approve the terms of a DIP financing charge, the September 18, 2009 amendments to the CCAA now expressly provide jurisdiction to grant a DIP financing charge. Section 11.2 of the Act states:

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge -- in an amount that the court considers appropriate -- in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.
- (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.
- (3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.
- (4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

(aa) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;

(b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;

(c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;

(d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;

(e) the nature and value of the company's property;

(f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and

(g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

32 In light of the language of section 11.2(1), the first issue to consider is whether notice has been given to secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge. Paragraph 57 of the proposed order affords priority to the DIP charge, the administration charge, the Directors' and Officers' charge and the KERP charge with the following exception: "any validly perfected purchase money security interest in favour of a secured creditor or any statutory encumbrance existing on the date of this order in favour of any person which is a "secured creditor" as defined in the CCAA in respect of any of source deductions from wages, employer health tax, workers compensation, GST/QST, PST payables, vacation pay and banked overtime for employees, and amounts under the Wage Earners' Protection Program that are subject to a super priority claim under the BIA". This provision coupled with the notice that was provided satisfied me that secured creditors either were served or are unaffected by the DIP charge. This approach is both consistent with the legislation and practical.

33 Secondly, the Court must determine that the amount of the DIP is appropriate and required having regard to the debtors' cash-flow statement. The DIP charge is for up to \$100 million. Prior to entering into the CIT facility, the CMI Entities sought proposals from other third party lenders for a credit facility that would convert to a DIP facility should the CMI Entities be required to file for protection under the CCAA. The CIT facility was the best proposal submitted. In this case, it is contemplated that implementation of the plan will occur no later than April 15, 2010. The total amount of cash on hand is expected to be down to approximately \$10 million by late December, 2009 based on the cash flow forecast. The applicants state that this is an insufficient cushion for an enterprise of this magnitude. The cash-flow statements project the need for the liquidity provided by

the DIP facility for the recapitalization transaction to be finalized. The facility is to accommodate additional liquidity requirements during the CCAA proceedings. It will enable the CMI Entities to operate as going concerns while pursuing the implementation and completion of a viable plan and will provide creditors with assurances of same. I also note that the proposed facility is simply a conversion of the pre-existing CIT facility and as such, it is expected that there would be no material prejudice to any of the creditors of the CMI Entities that arises from the granting of the DIP charge. I am persuaded that the amount is appropriate and required.

34 Thirdly, the DIP charge must not and does not secure an obligation that existed before the order was made. The only amount outstanding on the CIT facility is \$10.7 in outstanding letters of credit. These letters of credit are secured by existing security and it is proposed that that security rank ahead of the DIP charge.

35 Lastly, I must consider amongst others, the enumerated factors in paragraph 11.2(4) of the Act. I have already addressed some of them. The Management Directors of the applicants as that term is used in the materials filed will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. It would appear that management has the confidence of its major creditors. The CMI Entities have appointed a CRA and a Restructuring Officer to negotiate and implement the recapitalization transaction and the aforementioned directors will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. The DIP facility will enhance the prospects of a completed restructuring. CIT has stated that it will not convert the CIT facility into a DIP facility if the DIP charge is not approved. In its report, the proposed Monitor observes that the ability to borrow funds from a court approved DIP facility secured by the DIP charge is crucial to retain the confidence of the CMI Entities' creditors, employees and suppliers and would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made. The proposed Monitor is supportive of the DIP facility and charge.

36 For all of these reasons, I was prepared to approve the DIP facility and charge.

(d) Administration Charge

37 While an administration charge was customarily granted by courts to secure the fees and disbursements of the professional advisors who guided a debtor company through the CCAA process, as a result of the amendments to the CCAA, there is now statutory authority to grant such a charge. Section 11.52 of the CCAA states:

- (1) On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge -- in an amount that the court considers appropriate -- in respect of the fees and expenses of

(a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or

other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;

(b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and

(c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

- (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

38 I must therefore be convinced that (1) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; (2) the amount is appropriate; and (3) the charge should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries.

39 As with the DIP charge, the issue relating to notice to affected secured creditors has been addressed appropriately by the applicants. The amount requested is up to \$15 million. The beneficiaries of the charge are: the Monitor and its counsel; counsel to the CMI Entities; the financial advisor to the Special Committee and its counsel; counsel to the Management Directors; the CRA; the financial advisor to the Ad Hoc Committee; and RBC Capital Markets and its counsel. The proposed Monitor supports the aforementioned charge and considers it to be required and reasonable in the circumstances in order to preserve the going concern operations of the CMI Entities. The applicants submit that the above-note professionals who have played a necessary and integral role in the restructuring activities to date are necessary to implement the recapitalization transaction.

40 Estimating quantum is an inexact exercise but I am prepared to accept the amount as being appropriate. There has obviously been extensive negotiation by stakeholders and the restructuring is of considerable magnitude and complexity. I was prepared to accept the submissions relating to the administration charge. I have not included any requirement that all of these professionals be required to have their accounts scrutinized and approved by the Court but they should not preclude this possibility.

(e) Critical Suppliers

41 The next issue to consider is the applicants' request for authorization to pay pre-filing amounts owed to critical suppliers. In recognition that one of the purposes of the CCAA is to permit an insolvent corporation to remain in business, typically courts exercised their inherent jurisdiction to

grant such authorization and a charge with respect to the provision of essential goods and services. In the recent amendments, Parliament codified the practice of permitting the payment of pre-filing amounts to critical suppliers and the provision of a charge. Specifically, section 11.4 provides:

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.
- (2) If the court declares a person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.
- (3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.
- (4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

42 Under these provisions, the Court must be satisfied that there has been notice to creditors likely to be affected by the charge, the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company, and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation. While one might interpret section 11.4 (3) as requiring a charge any time a person is declared to be a critical supplier, in my view, this provision only applies when a court is compelling a person to supply. The charge then provides protection to the unwilling supplier.

43 In this case, no charge is requested and no additional notice is therefore required. Indeed, there is an issue as to whether in the absence of a request for a charge, section 11.4 is even applicable and the Court is left to rely on inherent jurisdiction. The section seems to be primarily directed to the conditions surrounding the granting of a charge to secure critical suppliers. That said, even if it is applicable, I am satisfied that the applicants have met the requirements. The CMI Entities seek authorization to make certain payments to third parties that provide goods and services integral to their business. These include television programming suppliers given the need for continuous and undisturbed flow of programming, newsprint suppliers given the dependency of the National Post on a continuous and uninterrupted supply of newsprint to enable it to publish and on newspaper distributors, and the American Express Corporate Card Program and Central Billed Accounts that are required for CMI Entity employees to perform their job functions. No payment would be made without the consent of the Monitor. I accept that these suppliers are critical in nature. The CMI Entities also seek more general authorization allowing them to pay other suppliers if in the opinion of the CMI Entities, the supplier is critical. Again, no payment would be made without the consent

of the Monitor. In addition, again no charge securing any payments is sought. This is not contrary to the language of section 11.4 (1) or to its purpose. The CMI Entities seek the ability to pay other suppliers if in their opinion the supplier is critical to their business and ongoing operations. The order requested is facilitative and practical in nature. The proposed Monitor supports the applicants' request and states that it will work to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities are minimized. The Monitor is of course an officer of the Court and is always able to seek direction from the Court if necessary. In addition, it will report on any such additional payments when it files its reports for Court approval. In the circumstances outlined, I am prepared to grant the relief requested in this regard.

(f) Directors' and Officers' Charge

44 The applicants also seek a directors' and officers' ("D &O") charge in the amount of \$20 million. The proposed charge would rank after the administration charge, the existing CIT security, and the DIP charge. It would rank *pari passu* with the KERP charge discussed subsequently in this endorsement but postponed in right of payment to the extent of the first \$85 million payable under the secured intercompany note.

45 Again, the recent amendments to the CCAA allow for such a charge. Section 11.51 provides that:

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge -- in an amount that the court considers appropriate -- in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company
- (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.
- (3) The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.
- (4) The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

46 I have already addressed the issue of notice to affected secured creditors. I must also be satisfied with the amount and that the charge is for obligations and liabilities the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of proceedings. It is not to extend to coverage of wilful

misconduct or gross negligence and no order should be granted if adequate insurance at a reasonable cost could be obtained.

47 The proposed Monitor reports that the amount of \$20 million was estimated taking into consideration the existing D&O insurance and the potential liabilities which may attach including certain employee related and tax related obligations. The amount was negotiated with the DIP lender and the Ad Hoc Committee. The order proposed speaks of indemnification relating to the failure of any of the CMI Entities, after the date of the order, to make certain payments. It also excludes gross negligence and wilful misconduct. The D&O insurance provides for \$30 million in coverage and \$10 million in excess coverage for a total of \$40 million. It will expire in a matter of weeks and Canwest Global has been unable to obtain additional or replacement coverage. I am advised that it also extends to others in the Canwest enterprise and not just to the CMI Entities. The directors and senior management are described as highly experienced, fully functional and qualified. The directors have indicated that they cannot continue in the restructuring effort unless the order includes the requested directors' charge.

48 The purpose of such a charge is to keep the directors and officers in place during the restructuring by providing them with protection against liabilities they could incur during the restructuring: *Re General Publishing Co.*¹⁰ Retaining the current directors and officers of the applicants would avoid destabilization and would assist in the restructuring. The proposed charge would enable the applicants to keep the experienced board of directors supported by experienced senior management. The proposed Monitor believes that the charge is required and is reasonable in the circumstances and also observes that it will not cover all of the directors' and officers' liabilities in the worst case scenario. In all of these circumstances, I approved the request.

(g) Key Employee Retention Plans

49 Approval of a KERP and a KERP charge are matters of discretion. In this case, the CMI Entities have developed KERPs that are designed to facilitate and encourage the continued participation of certain of the CMI Entities' senior executives and other key employees who are required to guide the CMI Entities through a successful restructuring with a view to preserving enterprise value. There are 20 KERP participants all of whom are described by the applicants as being critical to the successful restructuring of the CMI Entities. Details of the KERPs are outlined in the materials and the proposed Monitor's report. A charge of \$5.9 million is requested. The three Management Directors are seasoned executives with extensive experience in the broadcasting and publishing industries. They have played critical roles in the restructuring initiatives taken to date. The applicants state that it is probable that they would consider other employment opportunities if the KERPs were not secured by a KERP charge. The other proposed participants are also described as being crucial to the restructuring and it would be extremely difficult to find replacements for them.

50 Significantly in my view, the Monitor who has scrutinized the proposed KERPs and charge is

supportive. Furthermore, they have been approved by the Board, the Special Committee, the Human Resources Committee of Canwest Global and the Ad Hoc Committee. The factors enumerated in *Re Grant Forest*¹¹ have all been met and I am persuaded that the relief in this regard should be granted.

51 The applicants ask that the Confidential Supplement containing unredacted copies of the KERPs that reveal individually identifiable information and compensation information be sealed. Generally speaking, judges are most reluctant to grant sealing orders. An open court and public access are fundamental to our system of justice. Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act* provides authority to grant a sealing order and the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*¹² provides guidance on the appropriate legal principles to be applied. Firstly, the Court must be satisfied that the order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk. Secondly, the salutary effects of the order should outweigh its deleterious effects including the effects on the right to free expression which includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

52 In this case, the unredacted KERPs reveal individually identifiable information including compensation information. Protection of sensitive personal and compensation information the disclosure of which could cause harm to the individuals and to the CMI Entities is an important commercial interest that should be protected. The KERP participants have a reasonable expectation that their personal information would be kept confidential. As to the second branch of the test, the aggregate amount of the KERPs has been disclosed and the individual personal information adds nothing. It seems to me that this second branch of the test has been met. The relief requested is granted.

Annual Meeting

53 The CMI Entities seek an order postponing the annual general meeting of shareholders of Canwest Global. Pursuant to section 133 (1)(b) of the CBCA, a corporation is required to call an annual meeting by no later than February 28, 2010, being six months after the end of its preceding financial year which ended on August 31, 2009. Pursuant to section 133 (3), despite subsection (1), the corporation may apply to the court for an order extending the time for calling an annual meeting.

54 CCAA courts have commonly granted extensions of time for the calling of an annual general meeting. In this case, the CMI Entities including Canwest Global are devoting their time to stabilizing business and implementing a plan. Time and resources would be diverted if the time was not extended as requested and the preparation for and the holding of the annual meeting would likely impede the timely and desirable restructuring of the CMI Entities. Under section 106(6) of the CBCA, if directors of a corporation are not elected, the incumbent directors continue. Financial and other information will be available on the proposed Monitor's website. An extension is properly granted.

Other

55 The applicants request authorization to commence Chapter 15 proceedings in the U.S. Continued timely supply of U.S. network and other programming is necessary to preserve going concern value. Commencement of Chapter 15 proceedings to have the CCAA proceedings recognized as "foreign main proceedings" is a prerequisite to the conversion of the CIT facility into the DIP facility. Authorization is granted.

56 Canwest's various corporate and other entities share certain business services. They are seeking to continue to provide and receive inter-company services in the ordinary course during the CCAA proceedings. This is supported by the proposed Monitor and FTI will monitor and report to the Court on matters pertaining to the provision of inter-company services.

57 Section 23 of the amended CCAA now addresses certain duties and functions of the Monitor including the provision of notice of an Initial Order although the Court may order otherwise. Here the financial threshold for notice to creditors has been increased from \$1000 to \$5000 so as to reduce the burden and cost of such a process. The proceedings will be widely published in the media and the Initial Order is to be posted on the Monitor's website. Other meritorious adjustments were also made to the notice provisions.

58 This is a "pre-packaged" restructuring and as such, stakeholders have negotiated and agreed on the terms of the requested order. That said, not every stakeholder was before me. For this reason, interested parties are reminded that the order includes the usual come back provision. The return date of any motion to vary, rescind or affect the provisions relating to the CIT credit agreement or the CMI DIP must be no later than November 5, 2009.

59 I have obviously not addressed every provision in the order but have attempted to address some key provisions. In support of the requested relief, the applicants filed a factum and the proposed Monitor filed a report. These were most helpful. A factum is required under Rule 38.09 of the Rules of Civil Procedure. Both a factum and a proposed Monitor's report should customarily be filed with a request for an Initial Order under the CCAA.

Conclusion

60 Weak economic conditions and a high debt load do not a happy couple make but clearly many of the stakeholders have been working hard to produce as desirable an outcome as possible in the circumstances. Hopefully the cooperation will persist.

S.E. PEPALL J.

cp/e/qlafr/qljxr/qljxh/qlaxr/qlaxw/qlcal/qlced

1 *R.S.C. 1985, c. C. 36, as amended*

2 *R.S.C. 1985, c.C.44.*

3 *R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as amended.*

4 (2004), 48 *C.B.R. (4th)* 299; *leave to appeal refused, [2004] O.J. No. 1903, 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (C.A.).*

5 (1993), 9 *B.L.R. (2d)* 275.

6 [2009] *O.J. No. 349.*

7 (2006), 19 *C.B.R. (5th)* 187.

8 (1995), 30 *C.B.R. (3d)* 29.

9 (2004), 33 *B.C.L.R. (4th)* 155.

10 (2003), 39 *C.B.R. (4th)* 216.

11 [2009] *O.J. No. 3344.* That said, given the nature of the relationship between a board of directors and senior management, it may not always be appropriate to give undue consideration to the principle of business judgment.

12 [2002] 2 *S.C.R.* 522.

TAB 2

2009 CarswellOnt 7882,

2009 CarswellOnt 7882

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, C-36, AS
AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST
GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS CORP. AND THE OTHER APPLICANTS LISTED ON SCHEDULE "A"

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Pepall J.

Heard: December 8, 2009

Judgment: December 15, 2009

Docket: CV-09-8241-OOCL

© Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its Licensors. All rights reserved.

Counsel: Lyndon Barnes, Alex Cobb, Shawn Irving for CMI Entities

Alan Mark, Alan Merskey for Special Committee of the Board of Directors of Canwest

David Byers, Maria Konyukhova for Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Benjamin Zarnett, Robert Chadwick for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders

K. McElcheran, G. Gray for GS Parties

Hugh O'Reilly, Amanda Darrach for Canwest Retirees and the Canadian Media Guild

Hilary Clarke for Senior Secured Lenders to LP Entities

Steve Weisz for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure; Corporate and Commercial

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Proceedings subject to stay — Contractual rights

Business was acquired through acquisition company, C Co. — C Co. was jointly owned by moving parties and 441 Inc., wholly owned subsidiary of insolvent entities — Moving parties, 441 Inc., insolvent entities and C Co. entered into shareholders agreement providing that in event of insolvency of insolvent entities, moving parties

could effect sale of their interest in C Co. and require sale of insolvent entities' interest — Shareholders agreement also provided that 441 Inc. could transfer its C Co. shares to insolvent entities at any time — 441 Inc. subsequently transferred shares of C Co. to insolvent entities and was dissolved — Insolvent entities obtained initial order under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act including stay of proceedings — Moving parties brought motion seeking to set aside transfer of shares to insolvent entities or, in alternative, requiring insolvent entities to perform and not disclaim shareholders agreement as if shares had not been transferred — Insolvent entities brought motion for order that motion of moving parties was stayed — Moving parties brought cross-motion for leave to proceed with their motion — Motion of insolvent entities granted; motion and cross-motion of moving parties dismissed — Substance and subject matter of moving parties' motion were encompassed by stay — Substance of moving parties' motion was "proceeding" that was subject to stay under initial order which prohibited commencement of all proceedings against or in respect of insolvent entities or affecting business or property of insolvent entities — Relief sought would involve exercise of any right or remedy affecting business or property of insolvent entities which was stayed under initial order.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Lifting of stay

Business was acquired through acquisition company, C Co. — C Co. was jointly owned by moving parties and 441 Inc., wholly owned subsidiary of insolvent entities — Moving parties, 441 Inc., insolvent entities and C Co. entered into shareholders agreement providing that in event of insolvency of insolvent entities, moving parties could effect sale of their interest in C Co. and require sale of insolvent entities' interest — Shareholders agreement also provided that 441 Inc. could transfer its C Co. shares to insolvent entities at any time — 441 Inc. subsequently transferred shares of C Co. to insolvent entities and was dissolved — Insolvent entities obtained initial order under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act including stay of proceedings — Moving parties brought motion seeking to set aside transfer of shares from 441 Inc. to insolvent entities or, in alternative, requiring insolvent entities to perform and not disclaim shareholders agreement as if shares had not been transferred — Insolvent entities brought motion for order that motion of moving parties was stayed — Moving parties brought cross-motion for leave to proceed with their motion — Motion of insolvent entities granted; motion and cross-motion of moving parties dismissed — Stay of proceedings not lifted — Balance of convenience, assessment of relative prejudice and relevant merits favoured position of insolvent entities — There was good arguable case that shareholders agreement, which would inform reasonable expectations of parties, permitted transfer and dissolution of 441 Inc. — Moving parties were in no worse position than any other stakeholder who was precluded from relying on rights that arose upon insolvency default — If stay were lifted, prejudice to insolvent entities would be great and proceedings contemplated by moving parties would be extraordinarily disruptive — Litigating subject matter of motion would undermine objective of protecting insolvent entities while they attempted to restructure — It was premature to address issue of whether insolvent entities could disclaim agreement — Issues surrounding any attempt at disclaimer should be canvassed on basis mandated in s. 32 of Act — Discretion to lift stay on basis of lack of good faith not exercised.

Cases considered by *Pepall J.*:

Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339, 1992 CarswellOnt 185 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

Canadian Airlines Corp., Re (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 2000 CarswellAlta 622 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 1990 CarswellBC 394, 4

C.B.R. (3d) 311, (sub nom. *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada*) [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (B.C. C.A.) — considered

ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd. (2007), 2007 SKCA 72, 2007 CarswellSask 324, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, (sub nom. *Bricore Land Group Ltd., Re*) 299 Sask. R. 194, (sub nom. *Bricore Land Group Ltd., Re*) 408 W.A.C. 194, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50 (Sask. C.A.) — referred to

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd. (1988), 92 A.R. 81, 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361, 1988 CarswellAlta 318 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

San Francisco Gifts Ltd., Re (2004), 5 C.B.R. (5th) 92, 42 Alta. L.R. (4th) 352, 2004 ABQB 705, 2004 CarswellAlta 1241, 359 A.R. 71 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

Stelco Inc., Re (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 196 O.A.C. 142 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 8 — referred to

s. 11 — referred to

s. 11.02(1) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.02(2) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 32 — considered

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43

s. 106 — referred to

Rules considered:

Rules of Civil Procedure, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194

R. 25.11(b) — referred to

R. 25.11(c) — referred to

MOTION by moving party to set aside transfer of shares to insolvent entities or, in alternative, requiring insolvent entities to perform and not disclaim shareholders agreement; MOTION by insolvent entities for order that motion by moving party was stayed; CROSS-MOTION by moving party for leave to proceed with its motion.

Pepall J.:

Relief Requested

1 The CCAA applicants and partnerships (the "CMI Entities") request an order declaring that the relief sought by GS Capital Partners VI Fund L.P., GSCP VI AA One Holding S.ar.1 and GS VI AA One Parallel Holding S.ar.1 (the "GS Parties") is subject to the stay of proceedings granted in my Initial Order dated October 6, 2009. The GS Parties bring a cross-motion for an order that the stay be lifted so that they may pursue their motion which, among other things, challenges pre-filing conduct of the CMI Entities. The Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders and the Special Committee of the Board of Directors support the position of the CMI Entities. All of these stakeholders are highly sophisticated. Put differently, no one is a commercial novice. Such is the context of this dispute.

Background Facts

2 Canwest's television broadcast business consists of the CTLP TV business which is comprised of 12 free-to-air television stations and a portfolio of subscription based specialty television channels on the one hand and the Specialty TV Business on the other. The latter consists of 13 specialty television channels that are operated by CMI for the account of CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries and 4 other specialty television channels in which the CW Investments Co. ownership interest is less than 50%.

3 The Specialty TV Business was acquired jointly with Goldman Sachs from Alliance Atlantis in August, 2007. In January of that year, CMI and Goldman Sachs agreed to acquire the business of Alliance Atlantis through a jointly owned acquisition company which later became CW Investments Co. It is a Nova Scotia Unlimited Liability Corporation ("NSULC").

4 CMI held its shares in CW Investments Co. through its wholly owned subsidiary, 4414616 Canada Inc. ("441"). According to the CMI Entities, the sole purpose of 441 was to insulate CMI from any liabilities of CW Investments Co. As a NSULC, its shareholders may face exposure if the NSULC is liquidated or becomes bankrupt. As such, 441 served as a "blocker" to potential liability. The CMI Entities state that similarly the GS parties served as "blockers" for Goldman Sachs' part of the transaction.

5 According to the GS Parties, the essential elements of the deal were as follows:

- (i) GS would acquire at its own expense and at its own risk, the slower growth businesses;
- (ii) CW Investments Co. would acquire the Specialty TV Business and that company would be owned by 441 and the GS Parties under the terms of a Shareholders Agreement;
- (iii) GS would assist CW Investments Co. in obtaining separate financing for the Specialty TV Business;
- (iv) Eventually Canwest would contribute its conventional TV business on a debt free basis to CW Investments Co. in return for an increased ownership stake in CW Investments Co.

6 The GS Parties also state that but for this arrangement, Canwest had no chance of acquiring control of the Specialty TV Business. That business is subject to regulation by the CRTC. Consistent with policy objectives, the CRTC had to satisfy itself that CW Investments Co. was not controlled either at law or in fact by a non-Canadian.

7 A Shareholders Agreement was entered into by the GS parties, CMI, 441, and CW Investments Co. The GS Parties state that 441 was a critical party to this Agreement. The Agreement reflects the share ownership of each of the parties to it: 64.67% held by the GS Parties and 35.33% held by 441. It also provides for control of CW Investments Co. by distribution of voting shares: 33.33% held by the GS Parties and 66.67% held by 441. The Agreement limits certain activities of CW Investments Co. without the affirmative vote of a director nominated to its Board by the GS Parties. The Agreement provides for call and put options that are designed to allow the GS parties to exit from the investment in CW Investments Co. in 2011, 2012, and 2013. Furthermore, in the event of an insolvency of CMI, the GS parties have the ability to effect a sale of their interest in CW Investments Co. and require as well a sale of CMI's interest. This is referred to as the drag-along provision. Specifically, Article 6.10(a) of the Shareholders Agreement states:

Notwithstanding the other provisions of this Article 6, if an Insolvency Event occurs in respect of CanWest and is continuing, the GS Parties shall be entitled to sell all of their Shares to any *bona fide* Arm's Length third party or parties at a price and on other terms and conditions negotiated by GSCP in its discretion provided that such third party or parties acquires all of the Shares held by the CanWest Parties at the same price and on the same terms and conditions, and in such event, the CanWest Parties shall sell their Shares to such third party or parties at such price and on such terms and conditions. The Corporation and the CanWest Parties each agree to cooperate with and assist GSCP with the sale process (including by providing protected purchasers designated by GSCP with confidential information regarding the Corporation (subject to a customary confidentiality agreement) and with access to management).

8 The Agreement also provided that 441 as shareholder could transfer its CW Investments Co. shares to its parent, CMI, at any time, by gift, assignment or otherwise, whether or not for value. While another specified entity could not be dissolved, no prohibition was placed on the dissolution of 441. 441 had certain voting obligations that were to be carried out at the direction of CMI. Furthermore, CMI was responsible for ensuring the performance by 441 of its obligations under the Shareholders Agreement.

9 On October 5, 2009, pursuant to a Dissolution Agreement between 441 and CMI and as part of the winding-up and distribution of its property, 441 transferred all of its property, namely its 352,986 Class A shares and 666 Class B preferred shares of CW Investments Co., to CMI. CMI undertook to pay and discharge all of 441's liabilities and obligations. The material obligations were those contained in the Shareholders Agreement. At the time, 441 and CW Investments Co. were both solvent and CMI was insolvent. 441 was subsequently dissolved.

10 For the purposes of these two motions only, the parties have agreed that the court should assume that the transfer and dissolution of 441 was intended by CMI to provide it with the benefit of all the provisions of the CCAA proceedings in relation to contractual obligations pertaining to those shares. This would presumably include both the stay provisions found in section 11 of the CCAA and the disclaimer provisions in section 32.

11 The CMI Entities state that CMI's interest in the Specialty TV Business is critical to the restructuring and recapitalization prospects of the CMI Entities and that if the GS parties were able to effect a sale of CW Investments Co. at this time, and on terms that suit them, it would be disastrous to the CMI Entities and their stakeholders. Even the overhanging threat of such a sale is adversely affecting the negotiation of a successful restructuring or recapitalization of the CMI Entities.

12 On October 6, 2009, I granted an Initial Order in these proceedings. CW Investments Co. was not an applicant. The CMI Entities requested a stay of proceedings to allow them to proceed to develop a plan of arrange-

ment or compromise to implement a consensual "pre-packaged" recapitalization transaction. The CMI Entities and the Ad Hoc Committee of 8% Noteholders had agreed on terms of such a transaction that were reflected in a support agreement and term sheet. Those noteholders who support the term sheet have agreed to vote in favour of the plan subject to certain conditions one of which is a requirement that the Shareholders Agreement be amended.

13 The Initial Order included the typical stay of proceedings provisions that are found in the standard form order promulgated by the Commercial List Users Committee. Specifically, the order stated:

15. THIS COURT ORDERS that until and including November 5, 2009, or such later date as this Court may order (the "Stay Period"), no proceeding or enforcement process in any court or tribunal (each, a "Proceeding") shall be commenced or continued against or in respect of the CMI Entities, the Monitor or the CMI CRA or affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property, except with the written consent of the applicable CMI Entity, the Monitor and the CMI CRA (in respect of Proceedings affecting the CMI Entities, the CMI Property or the CMI Business), the CMI CRA (in respect of Proceedings affecting the CMI Entities, the CMI property or the CMI Business), the CMI CRA (in respect of Proceedings affecting the CMI CRA), or with leave of this Court, and any and all Proceedings currently under way against or in respect of the CMI Entities or the CMI CRA or affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property are hereby stayed and suspended pending further Order of this Court. In the case of the CMI CRA, no Proceeding shall be commenced against the CMI CRA or its directors and officers without prior leave of this Court on seven (7) days notice to Stonecrest Capital Inc.

16. THIS COURT ORDERS that during the Stay Period, all rights and remedies of any individual, firm, corporation, governmental body or agency, or any other entities (all of the foregoing, collectively being "Persons" and each being a "Person") against or in respect of the CMI Entities, the Monitor and/or the CMI CRA, or affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property, are hereby stayed and suspended except with the written consent of the applicable CMI Entity, the Monitor and the CMI CRA (in respect of rights and remedies affecting the CMI Entities, the CMI Property or the CMI Business), the CMI CRA (in respect of rights or remedies affecting the CMI CRA), or leave of this Court, provided that nothing in this Order shall (i) empower the CMI Entities to carry on any business which the CMI Entities are not lawfully entitled to carry on, (ii) exempt the CMI Entities from compliance with statutory or regulatory provisions relating to health, safety or the environment, (iii) prevent the filing of any registration to preserve or perfect a security interest, or (iv) prevent the registration of a claim for lien.

14 The GS parties were not given notice of the CCAA application. On November 2, 2009, they brought a motion that, among other things, seeks to set aside the transfer of the shares from 441 to CMI or, in the alternative, require CMI to perform and not disclaim the Shareholders Agreement as if the shares had not been transferred. On November 10, 2009 the GS parties purported to revive 441 by filing Articles of Revival with the Director of the CBCA. The CMI Entities were not notified nor was any leave of the court sought in this regard. In an amended notice of motion dated November 19, 2009 (the "main motion"), the GS Parties request an order:

- (a) Setting aside and declaring void the transfer of the shares from 441 to CMI;
- (b) declaring that the rights and remedies of the GS Parties in respect of the obligations of 441 under the Shareholders Agreement are not affected by these CCAA proceedings in any way whatsoever;
- (c) in the alternative to (a) and (b), an order directing CMI to perform all of the obligations that bound 441

immediately prior to the transfer;

(d) in the alternative to (a) and (b), an order declaring that the obligations that bound 441 immediately prior to the transfer, may not be disclaimed by CMI pursuant to section 32 of the CCAA or otherwise; and

(e) if necessary, a trial of the issues arising from the foregoing.

15 They also requested an order amending paragraph 59 of the Initial Order but that issue has now been resolved and I am satisfied with the amendment proposed.

16 The CMI Entities then brought a motion on November 24, 2009 for an order that the GS motion is stayed. As in a game of chess, on December 3, 2009, the GS Parties served a cross-motion in which, if required, they seek leave to proceed with their motion.

17 In furtherance of their main motion, the GS Parties have expressed a desire to examine 4 of the 5 members of the Special Committee of the Board of Directors of Canwest. That Committee was constituted, among other things, to oversee the restructuring. The GS Parties have also demanded an extensive list of documentary production. They also seek to impose significant discovery demands upon the senior management of CanWest.

Issues

18 The issues to be determined on these motions are whether the relief requested by the GS Parties in their main motion is stayed based on the Initial Order and if so, whether the stay should be lifted. In addition, should the relief sought in paragraph 1(e) of the main motion be struck.

Positions of Parties

19 In brief, the parties' positions are as follows. The CMI Entities submit that the GS Parties' motion is a "proceeding" that is subject to the stay under paragraph 15 of the Initial Order. In addition, the relief sought by them involves "the exercise of any right or remedy affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property" which is stayed under paragraph 16 of the Initial Order. The stay is consistent with the purpose of the CCAA. They submit that the subject matter of the motion should be caught so as to prevent the GS parties from gaining an unfair advantage over other stakeholders of the CMI Entities and to ensure that the resources of the CMI Entities are devoted to developing a viable restructuring plan for the benefit of all stakeholders. They also state that CMI's interest in CW Investments Co. is a significant portion of its enterprise value. They state further that their actions were not in breach of the Shareholders Agreement and in any event, debtor companies are able to organize their affairs in order to benefit from the CCAA stay. Furthermore, any loss suffered by the GS Parties can be quantified.

20 In paragraph 1(e) of the main motion, the GS parties seek to prevent CMI from disclaiming the obligations of 441 that existed immediately prior to the transfer of the shares to CMI. If this relief is not stayed, the CMI Entities submit that it should be struck out pursuant to Rule 25.11(b) and (c) as premature and improper. They also argue that section 32 of the CCAA provides a procedure for disclaimer of agreements which the GS Parties improperly seek to circumvent.

21 Lastly, the CMI Entities state that the bases on which a CCAA stay should be lifted are very limited. Most of the grounds set forth in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*[FN1] which support the lifting of a stay are manifestly inapplicable. As to prejudice, the GS parties are in no worse position than any other stakeholder who is

precluded from relying on rights that arise on an insolvency default. In contrast, the prejudice to the CMI Entities would be debilitating and their resources need to be devoted to their restructuring. The GS Parties' rights would not be lost by the passage of time. The GS Parties' motion is all about leverage and a desire to improve the GS Parties' negotiating position submits counsel for the CMI Entities.

22 The Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders, as mentioned, supports the CMI Entities' position. In examining the context of the dispute, they submit that the Shareholders Agreement permitted and did not prohibit the transfer of 441's shares. Furthermore, the operative obligations in that agreement are obligations of CMI, not 441. It is the substance of the GS Parties' claims and not the form that should govern their ability to pursue them and it is clearly encompassed by the stay. The Committee relies on *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* [FN2] in support of their position on timing.

23 The Special Committee also supports the CMI Entities. It submits that the primary relief sought by the GS parties is a declaration that their contracts to and with CW Investments cannot or should not be disclaimed. The debate as to whether 441 could properly be assimilated into CMI is no more than an alternate argument as to why such disclaimer can or cannot occur. They state that the subject matter of the GS Parties' motion is premature.

24 The GS Parties submit that the stay does not prevent parties affected by the CCAA proceedings from bringing motions within the CCAA proceedings themselves. The use of CCAA powers and the scope of the stay provided in the Initial Order and whether it applies to the GS Parties' motion are proper questions for the court charged with supervising the CCAA process. They also argue that the motion would facilitate negotiation between key parties, raises the important preliminary issue of the proper scope and application of section 32 of the CCAA, and avoids putting the Monitor in the impossible position of having to draw legal conclusions as to the scope of CMI's power to disclaim. The court should be concerned with pre-filing conduct including the reason for the share transfer, the timing, and CMI's intentions.

25 Even if the stay is applicable, the GS parties submit that it should be lifted. In this regard, the court should consider the balance of convenience, the relative prejudice to parties, and where relevant, the merits of the proposed action. The court should also consider whether the debtor company has acted and is acting in good faith. The GS Parties were the medium by which the Specialty TV Business became part of Canwest. Here, all that is being sought is a reversal of the false and highly prejudicial start to these restructuring proceedings. It is necessary to take steps now to protect a right that could be lost by the passage of time. The transfer of the shares exhibited bad faith on the part of Canwest. 441 insulated CW Investments Co. and the Specialty TV Business from the insolvency of CMI and thereby protected the contractual rights of the GS Parties. The manifest harm to the GS Parties that invited the motion should be given weight in the court's balancing of prejudices. Concerns as to disruption of the restructuring process could be met by imposing conditions on the lifting of a stay as, for example, the establishment of a timetable.

Discussion

(a) Legal Principles

26 First I will address the legal principles applicable to the granting and lifting of a CCAA stay.

27 The stay provisions in the CCAA are discretionary and are extraordinarily broad. Section 11.02 (1) and (2) states:

11.02 (1) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 30 days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act or the Winding-up and Restructuring Act;

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(2) A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

(a) staying until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

28 The underlying purpose of the court's power to stay proceedings has frequently been described in the case law. It is the engine that drives the broad and flexible statutory scheme of the CCAA: *Stelco Inc., Re* [FN3] and the key element of the CCAA process: *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*[FN4] The power to grant the stay is to be interpreted broadly in order to permit the CCAA to accomplish its legislative purpose. As noted in *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re*[FN5], the power to grant a stay extends to effect the position of a company's secured and unsecured creditors as well as other parties who could potentially jeopardize the success of the restructuring plan and the continuance of the company. As stated by Farley J. in that case,

"It has been held that the intention of the CCAA is to prevent any manoeuvres for positioning among the creditors during the period required to develop a plan and obtain approval of creditors. Such manoeuvres could give an aggressive creditor an advantage to the prejudice of others who are less aggressive and would undermine the company's financial position making it even less likely that the plan will succeed....The possibility that one or more creditors may be prejudiced should not affect the court's exercise of its authority to grant a stay of proceedings under the CCAA because this affect is offset by the benefit to all creditors and to the company of facilitating a reorganization. The court's primary concerns under the CCAA must be for the debtor and *all* of the creditors." [FN6] (Citations omitted)

29 The all encompassing scope of the CCAA is underscored by section 8 of the Act which precludes parties from contracting out of the statute. See *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* [FN7] in this regard.

30 Two cases dealing with stays merit specific attention. *Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* [FN8] was a decision granted in the early stages of the evolution of the CCAA. In that case, the plaintiffs

brought an action for damages including the loss of share value and loss of opportunity both against a company under CCAA protection and a bank. The statement of claim had been served before the company's CCAA filing. The plaintiff sought to lift the stay to proceed with its action. The bank sought an order staying the action against it pending the disposition of the CCAA proceedings. Blair J. examined the stay power described in the CCAA, section 106 of the Courts of Justice Act[FN9] and the court's inherent jurisdiction. He refused to lift the stay and granted the stay in favour of the bank until the expiration of the CCAA stay period. Blair J. stated that the plaintiff's claims may be addressed more expeditiously in the CCAA proceeding itself.[FN10] Presumably this meant through a claims process and a compromise of claims. The CCAA stay precludes the litigating of claims comparable to the plaintiff's in *Campeau*. If it were otherwise, the stay would have no meaningful impact.

31 The decision of *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* is also germane to the case before me. There, the Bank demanded payment from the debtor company and thereafter the debtor company issued instant trust deeds to qualify for protection under the CCAA. The bank commenced proceedings on debenture security and the next day the company sought relief under the CCAA. The court stayed the bank's enforcement proceedings. The bank appealed the order and asked the appellate court to set aside the stay order insofar as it restrained the bank from exercising its rights under its security. The B.C. Court of Appeal refused to do so having regard to the broad public policy objectives of the CCAA.

32 As with the imposition of a stay, the lifting of a stay is discretionary. There are no statutory guidelines contained in the Act. According to Professor R.H. McLaren in his book "Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy"[FN11], an opposing party faces a very heavy onus if it wishes to apply to the court for an order lifting the stay. In determining whether to lift the stay, the court should consider whether there are sound reasons for doing so consistent with the objectives of the CCAA, including a consideration of the balance of convenience, the relative prejudice to parties, and where relevant, the merits of the proposed action: *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.*[FN12]. That decision also indicated that the judge should consider the good faith and due diligence of the debtor company.[FN13]

33 Professor McLaren enumerates situations in which courts will lift a stay order. The first six were cited by Paperny J. in 2000 in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*[FN14] and Professor McLaren has added three more since then. They are:

1. When the plan is likely to fail.
2. The applicant shows hardship (the hardship must be caused by the stay itself and be independent of any pre-existing condition of the applicant creditor).
3. The applicant shows necessity for payment (where the creditors' financial problems are created by the order or where the failure to pay the creditor would cause it to close and thus jeopardize the debtor's company's existence).
4. The applicant would be significantly prejudiced by refusal to lift the stay and there would be no resulting prejudice to the debtor company or the positions of creditors.
5. It is necessary to permit the applicant to take steps to protect a right which could be lost by the passing of time.

6. After the lapse of a significant time period, the insolvent is no closer to a proposal than at the commencement of the stay period.
7. There is a real risk that a creditor's loan will become unsecured during the stay period.
8. It is necessary to allow the applicant to perfect a right that existed prior to the commencement of the stay period.
9. It is in the interests of justice to do so.

(b) Application

34 Turning then to an application of all of these legal principles to the facts of the case before me, I will first consider whether the subject matter of the main motion of the GS Parties is captured by the stay and then will address whether the stay should be lifted.

35 In analyzing the applicability of the stay, I must examine the substance of the main motion of the GS Parties and the language of the stay found in paragraphs 15 and 16 of my Initial Order.

36 In essence, the GS Parties' motion seeks to:

- (i) undo the transfer of the CW Investments Co. shares from 441 to CMI or
- (ii) require CMI to perform and not disclaim the Shareholders Agreement as though the shares had not been transferred.

37 It seems to me that the first issue is caught by the stay of proceedings and the second issue is properly addressed if and when CMI seeks to disclaim the Shareholders Agreement.

38 The substance of the GS Parties' motion is a "proceeding" that is subject to the stay under paragraph 15 of the Initial Order which prohibits the commencement of all proceedings against or in respect of the CMI Entities, or affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property. The relief sought would also involve "the exercise of any right or remedy affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property" which is stayed under paragraph 16 of the Initial Order.

39 When one examines the relief requested in detail, the application of the stay is clear. The GS Parties ask first for an order setting aside and declaring void the transfer of the shares from 441. As the shares have been transferred to the CMI Entities presumably pursuant to section 6.5(a) of the Shareholders Agreement, this is relief "affecting the CMI Property". Secondly, the GS Parties ask for a declaration that the rights and remedies of the GS Parties in respect of the obligations of 441 are not affected by the CCAA proceedings. This relief would permit the GS Parties to require CMI to tender the shares for sale pursuant to section 6.10 of the Shareholders Agreement. This too is relief affecting the CMI Entities and the CMI Property. Thirdly, they ask for an order directing CMI to perform all of the obligations that bound 441 prior to the transfer. This represents the exercise of a right or remedy against CMI and would affect the CMI Business and CMI Property in violation of paragraph 16 of the Initial Order. This is also stayed by virtue of paragraph 15. Fourthly, the GS Parties seek an order declaring that the obligations that bound 441 prior to the transfer may not be disclaimed. This both violates paragraph 16 of the Initial Order and also seeks to avoid the express provisions contained in the recent amendments to the CCAA that address disclaimer.

40 Accordingly, the substance and subject matter of the GS Parties' motion are certainly encompassed by the stay. As Mr. Barnes for the CMI Entities submitted, had CMI taken the steps it did six months ago and the GS Parties commenced a lawsuit, the action would have been stayed. Certainly to the extent that the GS Parties are seeking the freedom to exercise their drag along rights, these rights should be captured by the stay.

41 The real question, it seems to me, is whether the stay should be lifted in this case. In considering the request to lift the stay, it is helpful to consider the context and the provisions of the Shareholders Agreement. In his affidavit sworn November 24, 2009, Mr. Strike, the President of Corporate Development & Strategy Implementation of Canwest Global and its Recapitalization Officer, states that the joint acquisition from Alliance Atlantis was intensely and very carefully negotiated by the parties and that the negotiation was extremely complex and difficult. "Every aspect of the deal was carefully scrutinized, including the form, substance and precise terms of the Initial Shareholders Agreement." The Shareholders Agreement was finalized following the CRTC approval hearing. Among other things:

- Article 2.2 (b) provides that CMI is responsible for ensuring the performance by 441 of its obligations under the Shareholders Agreement.
- Article 6.1 contains a restriction on the transfer of shares.
- Article 6.5 addresses permitted transfers. Subsection (a) expressly permits each shareholder to transfer shares to a parent of the shareholder. CMI was the parent of the shareholder, 441.
- Article 6.10 provides that notwithstanding the other provisions of Article 6, if an insolvency event occurs (which includes the commencement of a CCAA proceeding), the GS Parties may sell their shares and cause the Canwest parties to sell their shares on the same terms. This is the drag along provision.
- Article 6.13 prohibits the liquidation or dissolution of another company[FN15] without the prior written consent of one of the GS Parties[FN16].

42 The recital of these provisions and the absence of any prohibition against the dissolution of 441 indicate that there is a good arguable case that the Shareholders Agreement, which would inform the reasonable expectations of the parties, permitted the transfer and dissolution.

43 The GS Parties are in no worse position than any other stakeholder who is precluded from relying on rights that arise upon an insolvency default. As stated in *San Francisco Gifts Ltd., Re*[FN17] :

"The Initial Order enjoined all of San Francisco's landlords from enforcing contractual insolvency clauses. This is a common prohibition designed, at least in part, to avoid a creditor frustrating the restructuring by relying on a contractual breach occasioned by the very insolvency that gave rise to proceedings in the first place."[FN18]

44 Similarly, in *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.*[FN19] , one of the debtor's joint venture partners in certain petroleum operations was unable to rely on an insolvency clause in an agreement that provided for the immediate replacement of the operator if it became bankrupt or insolvent.

45 If the stay were lifted, the prejudice to CMI would be great and the proceedings contemplated by the GS Parties would be extraordinarily disruptive. The GS Parties have asked to examine 4 of the 5 members of the Special Committee. The Special Committee is a committee of the Board of Directors of Canwest. Its mandate in-

cludes, among other things, responsibility for overseeing the implementation of a restructuring with respect to all, or part of the business and/or capital structure of Canwest. The GS Parties have also requested an extensive list of documentary production including all documents considered by the Special Committee and any member of that Committee relating to the matters at issue; all documents considered by the Board of Directors and any member of the Board of Directors relating to the matters at issue; all documents evidencing the deliberations, discussions and decisions of the Special Committee and the Board of Directors relating to the matters at issue; all documents relating to the matters at issue sent to or received by Leonard Asper, Derek Burney, David Drybrough, David Kerr, Richard Leipsic, John Maguire, Margot Micillef, Thomas Strike, and Hap Stephen, the Chief Restructuring Advisor appointed by the court. As stated by Mr. Strike in his affidavit sworn November 24, 2009,

The witnesses that the GS Parties propose to examine include the most senior executives of the CMI Entities; those who are most intensely involved in the enormously complex process of achieving a successful going concern restructuring or recapitalization of the CMI Entities. Myself, Mr. Stephen, Mr. Maguire and the others are all working flat out on trying to achieve a successful restructuring or recapitalization of the CMI Entities. Frankly, the last thing we should be doing at this point is preparing for a forensic examination, in minute detail, over events that have taken place over the past several months. At this point in the restructuring/recapitalization process, the proposed examination would be an enormous distraction and would significantly prejudice the CMI Entities' restructuring and recapitalization efforts.

46 While Mr. McElcheran for the GS Parties submits that the examinations and the scope of the examinations could be managed, in my view, the litigating of the subject matter of the motion would undermine the objective of protecting the CMI Entities while they attempt to restructure. The GS Parties continue to own their shares in CW Investments Co. as does CMI. CMI continues to operate the Specialty TV Business. Furthermore, CMI cannot sell the shares without the involvement of the Monitor and the court. None of these facts have changed. The drag along rights are stayed (although as Mr. McElcheran said, it is the cancellation of those rights that the GS Parties are concerned about.)

47 A key issue will be whether the CMI Parties can then disclaim that Agreement or whether they should be required to perform the obligations which previously bound 441. This issue will no doubt arise if and when the CMI Entities seek to disclaim the Shareholders Agreement. It is premature to address that issue now. Furthermore, section 32 of the CCAA now provides a detailed process for disclaimer. It states:

32.(1) Subject to subsections (2) and (3), a debtor company may — on notice given in the prescribed form and manner to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor — disclaim or resiliate any agreement to which the company is a party on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act. The company may not give notice unless the monitor approves the proposed disclaimer or resiliation.

(2) Within 15 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1), a party to the agreement may, on notice to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor, apply to a court for an order that the agreement is not to be disclaimed or resiliated.

(3) If the monitor does not approve the proposed disclaimer or resiliation, the company may, on notice to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor, apply to a court for an order that the agreement be disclaimed or resiliated.

(4) In deciding whether to make the order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a) whether the monitor approved the proposed disclaimer or resiliation;
- (b) whether the disclaimer or resiliation would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company; and
- (c) whether the disclaimer or resiliation would likely cause significant financial hardship to a party to the agreement.

48 Section 32, therefore, provides the scheme and machinery for the disclaimer of an agreement. If the monitor approves the disclaimer, another party may contest it. If the monitor does not approve the disclaimer, permission of the court must be obtained. It seems to me that the issues surrounding any attempt at disclaimer in this case should be canvassed on the basis mandated by Parliament in section 32 of the amended Act.

49 In my view, the balance of convenience, the assessment of relative prejudice and the relevant merits favour the position of the CMI Entities on this lift stay motion. As to the issue of good faith, the question is whether, absent more, one can infer a lack of good faith based on the facts outlined in the materials filed including the agreed upon admission by the CMI Entities. The onus to lift the stay is on the moving party. I decline to exercise my discretion to lift the stay on this basis.

50 Turning then to the factors listed by Professor McLaren, again I am not persuaded that based on the current state of affairs, any of the factors are such that the stay should be lifted. In light of this determination, there is no need to address the motion to strike paragraph 1(e) of the GS Parties' main motion.

51 The stay of proceedings in this case is performing the essential function of keeping stakeholders at bay in order to give the CMI Entities a reasonable opportunity to develop a restructuring plan. The motions of the GS Parties are dismissed (with the exception of that portion dealing with paragraph 59 of the Initial Order which is on consent) and the motion of the CMI Entities is granted with the exception of the strike portion which is moot.

52 The Monitor, reasonably in my view, did not take a position on these motions. Its counsel, Mr. Byers, advised the court that the Monitor was of the view that a commercial resolution was the best way to resolve the GS Parties' issues. It is difficult to disagree with that assessment.

Insolvent entities' motion granted; motion and cross-motion of moving party dismissed.

FN1 (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.).

FN2 (B.C. C.A.) at p. 4.

FN3 (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 36.

FN4 (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.).

FN5 (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

FN6 Ibid, at p. 32.

FN7 Supra, note 2

2009 CarswellOnt 7882,

FN8 (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

FN9 R.S.O. 1990, c.C.43.

FN10 Supra, note 6 at paras. 24 and 25.

FN11 (Aurora: Canada Law Book, looseleaf) at para. 3.3400.

FN12 (2007), 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50 (Sask. C.A.) at para. 68.

FN13 Ibid, at para. 68.

FN14 Supra, note 3.

FN15 This was 4414641 Canada Inc. but not 4414616 Canada Inc., the company in issue before me.

FN16 Specifically, GS Capital Partners VI Fund, L.P.

FN17 (2004), 5 C.B.R. (5th) 92 (Alta. Q.B.) at para.37.

FN18 Ibid, at para. 37.

FN19 (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 (Alta. Q.B.).

END OF DOCUMENT

TAB 3

CITATION: BDC Venture Capital Inc. v. Natural Convergence Inc., 2009 ONCA 665
DATE: 20090922
DOCKET: C50876

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

O'Connor A.C.J.O., Blair and Juriansz JJ.A.

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 101 OF THE COURTS
OF JUSTICE ACT, R.S.O. 1990, C.C.43, as amended, AND SECTION 47 OF THE
BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY ACT, R.S.C. 1985, C. B-3, as amended

BETWEEN

BDC Venture Capital Inc.

Applicant (Respondent in Appeal)

and

Natural Convergence Inc.

Respondent (Respondent in Appeal)

Orestes Pasparakis and Jamie Macdonald, for BluArc Communications Inc.

Jason Wadden, for Broadview Networks Inc.

David Elliott, for PricewaterhouseCoopers

Heard and released orally: September 10, 2009

On appeal from the orders of Justice Stanley J. Kershman of the Superior Court of Justice
dated July 31, 2009.

ENDORSEMENT

[1] BluArc Communications seeks to set aside the orders of Kershman J. dated July 31, 2009, appointing PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) as interim receiver of the assets of Natural Convergence Inc. (NCI) and authorizing the sale of those assets to Broadview Networks Inc. The principal attack on appeal is with respect to the sale order and the vesting order that accompanied it.

[2] NCI develops software that enables its licensees, including Broadview and BluArc, to sell voice-over-internet protocol telephone services to customers. Its financial position was perilous and beginning in early 2008, it commenced attempts to market its business or to secure new financing. These efforts proved unsuccessful.

[3] Ultimately, however, Broadview – the holder of 50% of its licences – came to its assistance. It provided a certain amount of initial financial support to prop up NCI's operations and then, on July 16, 2009, offered to purchase NCI's assets through a Term Sheet that included a “no shop” clause. Broadview says that its offer included a premium on the purchase price in exchange for that clause.

[4] Broadview's offer was accepted by the NCI board and supported by NCI's secured creditors. On July 31, 2009, Kershman J. was asked to appoint PwC as receiver and to authorize the sale. At the time, BluArc and others were disclosed as parties who had contacted the receiver to express an interest in acquiring the assets. The receiver was

unable, however, to communicate with other interested parties because of the “no shop” clause in the sale agreement. In its report to the court, the receiver indicated that it could not comment on the commercial reasonableness of the sale. However, all of NCI’s secured creditors agreed to the sale, even though the proceeds would be less than NCI’s total indebtedness to those creditors. BluArc was not given notice of these proceedings.

[5] After the orders were made and BluArc became aware of them, BluArc tendered what the receiver described as “a comparable” offer to purchase the assets and filed a notice of appeal from the orders of Justice Kershman. This led to a motion by Broadview before Lang J.A. in this court seeking an order lifting the automatic stay imposed under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* R.S.C. 1985 c. B-3. On that motion, the reality put squarely to the Court was that if the stay were lifted, the transaction would be closed, notwithstanding the pending appeal. Lang J.A. considered this fully and granted an order on September 2, 2009, lifting the stay. She also expedited the appeal to today’s date. The transaction was closed on September 3, 2009.

[6] Although BluArc moved to set aside the order of Lang J.A., counsel did not pursue that motion in the circumstances. Before us, it is argued that

- (a) BluArc does not have standing to appeal the orders of Kershman J;
- (b) the appeal should be dismissed as moot; and
- (c) the appeal should be dismissed on the merits.

Mr. Pasparakis, on behalf of BlueArc, makes the opposite arguments. We find it necessary to deal only with the first of these, as in our view, BlueArc does not have standing in the circumstances.

[7] BlueArc argues that it has standing on the basis that its relationship with the debtor NCI will be affected through the sale process. Mr. Pasparakis submits that BlueArc's customer/licensee relationship with NCI will be affected because if NCI sells its assets, BlueArc will not be able to receive the support, maintenance and upkeep services required to enable it to service its own customers with the licensed software product that is affecting its business. BlueArc is therefore not a "bitter bidder" or merely a creditor of the type that this court has said is not entitled to insert itself into receivership sale proceedings he argues. See *Skyepharm PLC v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corporation*, [2000] O.J. No. 467 (C.A.).

[8] We do not accept this argument. In our view, the relationship of BlueArc with NCI does not give rise to an interest that is sufficiently connected with the sale process so as to warrant standing in the sale proceedings. BlueArc does not have a legal or proprietary right in the property being sold. It is not a creditor or, even at this stage, a contingent creditor. To the extent it has an interest it is as licensee under its Master Licence Agreement. Under that Agreement, however, BlueArc chose to be protected in insolvency proceedings through the establishment of an escrow provision that entitles it to receive NCI's source code and "all supporting information, tools, notes and other information

necessary and sufficient to allow a reasonably qualified person to support and maintain the software.” Thus, it has a remedy that will address the very critical interest that BluArc argues is in need of protection through the bidding process. There is nothing in the expanded record on this appeal, or in the record that was before Kershman J., to indicate that this remedy is illusory. BluArc is therefore not “a party with a direct interest in the proceeds of the sale” in the sense referred to by this court in *Skyepharma*. As the Court said in that case at paras. 15-20:

[15] There are two main reasons why an unsuccessful prospective purchaser does not have a right or interest that is affected by a sale approval order. First, a prospective purchaser has no legal or proprietary right in the property being sold. Offers are submitted in a process in which there is no requirement that a particular offer be accepted. Orders appointing receivers commonly give the receiver a discretion as to which offers to accept and to recommend to the court for approval. The duties of the receiver and the court are to ensure that the sales are in the best interests of those with an interest in the proceeds of the sale. There is no right in a party who submits an offer to have the offer, even if the highest, accepted by either the receiver or the court: *Crown Trust v. Rosenberg, supra*.

[16] Moreover, the fundamental purpose of the sale approval motion is to consider the best interests of the parties with a direct interest in the proceeds of the sale, primarily the creditors. The unsuccessful would be purchaser has no interest in this issue. Indeed, the involvement of unsuccessful prospective purchasers could seriously distract from this fundamental purpose by including in the motion other issues with the potential for delay and additional expense.

[17] In making these comments, I recognize that a court conducting a sale approval motion is required to consider the integrity of the process by which the offers have been

obtained and to consider whether there has been unfairness in the working out of that process. *Crown Trust v. Rosenberg, supra; Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp.*, (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1 (C.A.). The examination of the sale process will in normal circumstances be focussed on the integrity of that process from the perspective of those for whose benefit it has been conducted. The inquiry into the integrity of the process may incidentally address the fairness of the process to prospective purchasers, but that in itself does not create a right or interest in a prospective purchaser that is affected by a sale approval order.

[18] In *Soundair*, the unsuccessful would be purchaser was a party to the proceedings and the court considered the fairness of the sale process from its standpoint. However, I do not think that the decision in *Soundair* conflicts with the position I have set out above for two reasons. First, the issue of whether the prospective purchaser had a legal right or interest was not specifically addressed by the court. Indeed, in describing the general principles that govern a sale approval motion, Galligan J.A., for the majority, adopted the approach in *Crown Trust v. Rosenberg*. Under the heading "Consideration of the interests of all the parties", he referred to the interests of the creditors, the debtor and a purchaser who has negotiated an agreement with the receiver. He did not mention the interests of unsuccessful would be purchasers. Second, the facts in *Soundair* were unusual. The unsuccessful offeror was a company in which Air Canada had a substantial interest. The order appointing the receiver specifically directed the receiver "to do all things necessary or desirable to complete a sale to Air Canada" and if a sale to Air Canada could not be completed to sell to another party. Arguably, this provision in the order of the court created an interest in Air Canada which could be affected by the sale approval order and which entitled it to standing in the sale approval proceedings.

[19] In limited circumstances, a prospective purchaser may become entitled to participate in a sale approval motion. For that to happen, it must be shown that the prospective purchaser acquired a legal right or interest from the circumstances of a particular sale process and that the nature

of the right or interest is such that it could be adversely affected by the approval order. A commercial interest is not sufficient.

[20] There is a sound policy reason for restricting, to the extent possible, the involvement of prospective purchasers in sale approval motions. There is often a measure of urgency to complete court approved sales. This case is a good example. When unsuccessful purchasers become involved, there is a potential for greater delay and additional uncertainty. This potential may, in some situations, create commercial leverage in the hands a disappointed would be purchaser which could be counterproductive to the best interests of those for whose benefit the sale is intended.

[9] Accordingly, we are of the view that BluArc does not have standing to bring the appeal. The appeal is therefore quashed. In view of this disposition, it is not necessary to deal with the argument that the appeal, for all practical and legal purposes, is moot, or to deal with the merits of the appeal.

[10] The appellants shall pay the respondents costs fixed in the amount of \$20,000 inclusive of disbursements and GST.

“D.R. O’Connor A.C.J.O.”

“R.A. Blair J.A.”

“R.G. Juriansz J.A.”

TAB 4

Skyepharma plc v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corporation
[Indexed as: Skyepharma plc v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.]

47 O.R. (3d) 234

[2000] O.J. No. 467

Docket Nos. M24061 and C33086

Court of Appeal for Ontario

Carthy, Goudge and O'Connor J.J.A.

February 18, 2000

Bankruptcy -- Receivers -- Sale of assets -- Receiver obtaining several offers to purchase assets -- Receiver seeking court approval for sale of assets to one of competing offerors -- Potential purchaser not having legal or proprietary interest affected by order approving sale -- Potential purchaser not having standing on motion for court approval.

Debtor and creditor -- Sale of assets -- Receiver obtaining several offers to purchase assets -- Receiver seeking court approval for sale of assets to one of competing offerors -- Potential purchaser not having legal or proprietary interest affected by order approving sale -- Potential purchaser not having standing on motion for court approval.

In August 1999, PC Inc. was appointed the receiver and manager of the assets of HP Corp. Subsequently, S plc, C Corp. and BP plc, who were all creditors of HP Corp., submitted offers to purchase the assets of HP Corp. On September 28, 1999, the receiver was given approval to enter into exclusive negotiations with S plc and C Corp. with respect to their offers, and the court order directed that no party was entitled to withdraw any outstanding offer until October 29, 1999.

In October 1999, the receiver reported to the court and also brought a motion for approval of an agreement to sell the assets to S plc. On the return of the motion, S plc, C Corp. and BP plc were permitted to make submissions in their capacity as creditors of HP Corp. C Corp. and BP plc opposed approval of the sale; however, the sale was approved and BP plc then appealed to the Court of Appeal.

The receiver moved to have the appeal quashed on the ground that the court did not have

jurisdiction. The receiver submitted that a potential purchaser does not have any legal or proprietary right that is affected by the court's approval of a sale and accordingly the potential purchaser does not have standing to challenge the order approving the sale.

Held, the appeal should be quashed.

Under s. 6(1) of the Courts of Justice Act, there is an appeal from a final order of a judge of the Superior Court of Justice. A final order is one that finally disposes of the rights of the parties. Thus, the question raised by the receiver's motion to quash was whether BP plc had a right that was finally disposed of by the sale approval order. The answer to that question was negative for two reasons. First, a prospective purchaser has no legal or proprietary right in the property being sold. There is no right in a party who submits an offer to have the offer, even if the highest, accepted by either the receiver or the court. Second, the fundamental purpose of the sale approval motion is to consider the best interests of the parties with a direct interest in the proceeds of the sale, primarily the creditors, and an unsuccessful purchaser has no interest in that issue. The involvement of unsuccessful prospective purchasers could seriously distract from the fundamental purpose of the approval motion. That BP plc had an offer to purchase did not give it a right or interest that was affected by the sale approval order. In its capacity as a potential purchaser, it was not entitled to standing on the motion nor was it entitled to appeal the approval order.

Cases referred to

British Columbia Development Corp. v. Spun Cast Industries Ltd. (1977), 5 B.C.L.R. 94, 26 C.B.R. (N.S.) 28 (S.C.); Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1981), 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303, 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 (C.A.); Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526, 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 320, 22 C.P.C. (2d) 131 (H.C.J.); Halbert v. Netherlands Investment Co., [1945] S.C.R. 329, [1945] 2 D.L.R. 418; Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 46 O.A.C. 321, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76, 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (C.A.)

Statutes referred to

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, s. 6(1)(b)

Rules and regulations referred to

Rules of Civil Procedure, O. Reg. 560/84, rule 13.01 -- now R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194

MOTION to quash an appeal to the Court of Appeal for Ontario.

James W.E. Doris, for appellant, Skypharm plc.
Alan H. Mark, for appellant, Bioglan Pharma plc.

Joseph M. Steiner and Steven G. Golick, for respondent, Pricewaterhouse Coopers Inc., court-appointed receiver of Hyal Pharmaceutical Corporation.

The judgment of the court was delivered by

[1] **O'CONNOR J.A.:** -- This is a motion to quash an appeal from the order of Farley J. made on October 24, 1999. By his order, Farley J. approved the sale of the assets of Hyal Pharmaceutical Corporation by the court-appointed receiver of Hyal to Skyepharma plc. Bioglan Pharma plc, a disappointed would-be purchaser of those assets has appealed, asking this court to set aside the sale approval order and to direct that there be a new sale process.

[2] The receiver moves to quash the appeal on the ground that Bioglan, as a potential purchaser, did not have any rights that were finally determined by the sale approval order. Accordingly, the receiver contends, this court does not have jurisdiction to hear the appeal.

Background

[3] Skyepharma, the largest creditor of Hyal, moved for the appointment of Pricewaterhouse Coopers Inc. as the receiver and manager of all of the assets of Hyal. On August 16, 1999, Molloy J. granted the order which included provisions authorizing the receiver to take the necessary steps to liquidate and realize upon the assets, to sell the assets (with court approval for transactions exceeding \$100,000) and to hold the proceeds of any sales pending further order of the court.

[4] On August 26, 1999, Cameron J. made an order approving the process proposed by the receiver for soliciting, receiving and considering expressions of interest and offers to purchase the assets of Hyal.

[5] The receiver reported to the court on September 27, 1999 and set out the results of the sale process. The receiver sought the court's approval to enter into exclusive negotiations with two parties which had made offers, Skyepharma and Cangene Corporation. The receiver indicated that it had also received an offer from Bioglan and explained why, in its view, the best realization was likely to result from negotiations with Skyepharma and Cangene.

[6] In its report, the receiver pointed out the importance of attempting to finalize the sale of the assets at an early date. The interest and damages on the secured and unsecured debt of Hyal were increasing in the amount of approximately \$70,000 a week. Professional fees and operational costs were also adding to the aggregate debt of the company.

[7] On September 28, 1999 Farley J. ordered that the receiver negotiate exclusively with Skyepharma and Cangene until October 6, in an attempt to conclude a transaction that was

acceptable to the receiver and that realized the superior value inherent in the offers made by Skyepharma and Cangene.¹ at end of document] The court also directed that no party would be entitled to retract, withdraw, vary or counteract any outstanding offer prior to October 29, 1999 and that, if the receiver was unable to reach agreement with Skyepharma or Cangene, then it would have the discretion to negotiate with other parties.

[8] On October 13, the receiver reported to the court on the results of the negotiations with Skyepharma and Cangene. The parties had been unable to structure the transaction to take advantage of Hyal's tax loss positions. Nevertheless, the receiver recommended approval for an agreement to sell the assets of Hyal to Skyepharma. In its report, the receiver pointed out that the agreement it was recommending did not necessarily maximize the realization for the assets but that it did minimize the risk of not closing and also the risk of liabilities increasing in the interim period up to closing, which risks arose from the provisions and time-frames contained in other offers. The receiver said that these risks were not immaterial.

[9] At the same time that the receiver filed its report it brought a motion for approval of the agreement with Skyepharma. The motion was heard by Farley J. on October 20, 1999. Counsel for Skyepharma, Cangene and Bioglan appeared and were permitted to make submissions. Skyepharma, which was both a creditor of Hyal and the purchaser under the agreement for which approval was being sought, supported the motion. Cangene and Bioglan, which in addition to being unsuccessful prospective purchasers, were also creditors of the company, opposed the motion.

[10] It is apparent that the motions judge heard the submissions of Cangene and Bioglan in their capacities as creditors of Hyal and not in their role as unsuccessful bidders for the assets being sold. In his endorsement made on October 24 he said:

Unsuccessful bidders have no standing to challenge a receiver's motion to approve the sale to another candidate. They have no legal or proprietary right as technically they are not affected by the order. They have no interest in the fundamental question of whether the court's approval is in the best interests of the parties directly involved.

The motions judge continued by saying that he would "take into account the objections of Bioglan and Cangene as they have shoehorned into the approval motion". This latter comment, as it applied to Bioglan, appears to refer to the fact that Bioglan only became a creditor after the receiver was appointed and then only by acquiring a small debt of Hyal in the amount of \$40,000.

[11] The motions judge approved the agreement for the sale of the assets to Skyepharma. In his endorsement, he noted that the assets involved were "unusual" and that the process to sell these assets was complex. He attached significant weight to the recommendation of the receiver who, he pointed out, had the expertise to deal with matters of this nature. The motions judge noted that the receiver's primary concern was to protect the interests of the creditors of Hyal. He recognized the advantages of avoiding risks that may result from the delay or uncertainty inherent in offers containing conditional provisions. The certainty and timeliness of the Skyepharma agreement were

important factors in both the recommendation of the receiver and in the reasons of the court for approving the sale.

[12] The motions judge said that "at first blush", it appeared that the receiver had conducted itself appropriately throughout the sale process. He reviewed the specific complaints of Cangene and Bioglan and concluded that, although the process was not perfect (my words), there was no impediment to approving the sale to Skyepharma.

[13] This court was advised by counsel that the transaction closed immediately after the order approving the sale was made.

[14] Bioglan has filed a notice of appeal seeking to set aside the approval order and asking that this court direct that the assets of Hyal be sold pursuant to a court-supervised judicial sale or, alternatively, that the receiver be required to re-open the bidding relating to the sale. The notice of appeal does not set out any specific grounds of appeal. It states only that the motions judge erred in approving the sale agreement.

[15] In argument, counsel for Bioglan said that there are two grounds of appeal. First, the receiver misinterpreted the order of September 28, 1999 and should have negotiated further with the non-exclusive bidders, including Bioglan, once it determined that a transaction based on the tax benefits of Hyal's tax loss position could not be structured. Second, the motions judge erred in holding that Bioglan had a full opportunity to participate in the process and was the author of its own misfortune by using a "low balling strategy".

Analysis

[16] The receiver moves to quash the appeal on the ground that this court does not have jurisdiction.

[17] Section 6(1)(b) of the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43 provides for a right of appeal to this court from a final order of a judge of the Superior Court of Justice. A final order is one that finally disposes of the rights of the parties: *Halbert v. Netherlands Investment Co.*, [1945] S.C.R. 329, [1945] 2 D.L.R. 418.

[18] The issue raised by the motion is whether Bioglan had a right that was finally disposed of by the sale approval order. Bioglan submits that there are four separate ways by which it acquired the necessary right. The first is one of general application that would apply to all unsuccessful prospective purchasers in court supervised sales. The other three arise from the specific circumstances of this case.

[19] First, Bioglan submits that because it made an offer to buy the assets of Hyal, it acquired a right that entitled it to participate in the sale approval motion and to oppose the order sought by the receiver. This right, Bioglan maintains, was finally disposed of by the order approving the sale to

Skyepharma.

[20] A similar issue was considered by Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526 (H.C.J.). In that case, a receiver brought a motion to approve the sale of certain properties. On the return of the motion, Larco Enterprises, a prospective purchaser whose offer was not being recommended for approval by the receiver, moved to intervene as an added party under rule 13.01 of the Rules of Civil Procedure, O. Reg. 560/84. The relevant portion of that rule, at the time, read as follows:

13.01(1) Where a person who is not a party to a proceeding claims,

- (a) an interest in the subject matter of the proceeding;
- (b) that he or she may be adversely affected by a judgment in the proceeding;

.....

the person may move for leave to intervene as an added party.² at end of document]

[21] Anderson J. concluded that "the proceeding" referred to in rule 13.01 only included an action or an application. The motion for approval of the sale by the receiver was neither. He therefore dismissed Larco's motion. He continued, however, and held that even if the proceeding was one to which the rule applied, Larco did not satisfy the criteria in it because it did not have an interest in the subject-matter of the sale approval motion nor did it have any legal or proprietary right that would be adversely affected by the court's order approving the sale.

[22] I adopt both his reasoning and his conclusion. At p. 118, he said:

The motion brought by Clarkson to approve the sales is one upon which the fundamental question for consideration is whether that approval is in the best interests of the parties to the action as being the approval of sales which will be most beneficial to them. In that fundamental question Larco has no interest at all. Its only interest is in seeking to have its offer accepted with whatever advantages will accrue to it as a result. That interest is purely incidental and collateral to the central issue in the substantive motion and, in my view, would not justify an exercise of the discretion given by the rule.

Nor, in my view, can Larco resort successfully to cl. (b) of rule 13.01(1) which raises the question whether it may be adversely affected by a judgment in the proceeding. For these purposes I leave aside the technical difficulties with respect to the word "judgment". In my view, Larco will not be adversely affected in respect of any legal or

proprietary right. It has no such right to be adversely affected. The most it will lose as a result of an order approving the sales as recommended, thereby excluding it, is a potential economic advantage only.

[23] The British Columbia Supreme Court reached a similar conclusion in *British Columbia Development Corp. v. Spun Cast Industries Ltd.* (1977), 26 C.B.R. (N.S.) 28, 5 B.C.L.R. 94 (S.C.). In that case the receiver in a debenture holder's action for foreclosure moved for an order to approve the sale of assets. A group of companies, the Shaw group, had made an offer and sought to be added as a party under a rule which authorized the court to add as a party any person "whose participation in the proceeding is necessary to ensure that all matters in the proceeding may be effectively adjudicated upon . . .". Berger J. dismissed this motion. At p. 30, he said:

The Shaw group of companies has no legal interest in the litigation at bar. It has a commercial interest, but that is not, in my view, sufficient to bring it within the rule. Simply because it has made an offer to purchase the assets of the company does not entitle it to be joined as a party. Nothing in *Gurtner v. Circuit* [cite omitted] goes so far. No order made in this action will result in any legal liability being imposed on the Shaw group, and no claim can be made against it on the strength of any such order.

[24] Although the issues considered in these cases are not identical to the case at bar, the reasoning applies to the issue raised on this appeal. If an unsuccessful prospective purchaser does not acquire an interest sufficient to warrant being added as a party to a motion to approve a sale, it follows that it does not have a right that is finally disposed of by an order made on that motion.

[25] There are two main reasons why an unsuccessful prospective purchaser does not have a right or interest that is affected by a sale approval order. First, a prospective purchaser has no legal or proprietary right in the property being sold. Offers are submitted in a process in which there is no requirement that a particular offer be accepted. Orders appointing receivers commonly give the receiver a discretion as to which offers to accept and to recommend to the court for approval. The duties of the receiver and the court are to ensure that the sales are in the best interests of those with an interest in the proceeds of the sale. There is no right in a party who submits an offer to have the offer, even if the highest, accepted by either the receiver or the court: *Crown Trust v. Rosenberg*, *supra*.

[26] Moreover, the fundamental purpose of the sale approval motion is to consider the best interests of the parties with a direct interest in the proceeds of the sale, primarily the creditors. The unsuccessful would be purchaser has no interest in this issue. Indeed, the involvement of unsuccessful prospective purchasers could seriously distract from this fundamental purpose by including in the motion other issues with the potential for delay and additional expense.

[27] In making these comments, I recognize that a court conducting a sale approval motion is required to consider the integrity of the process by which the offers have been obtained and to consider whether there has been unfairness in the working out of that process: *Crown Trust v.*

Rosenberg, *supra*; Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76 (C.A.). The examination of the sale process will in normal circumstances be focused on the integrity of that process from the perspective of those for whose benefit it has been conducted. The inquiry into the integrity of the process may incidentally address the fairness of the process to prospective purchasers, but that in itself does not create a right or interest in a prospective purchaser that is affected by a sale approval order.

[28] In Soundair, the unsuccessful would be purchaser was a party to the proceedings and the court considered the fairness of the sale process from its standpoint. However, I do not think that the decision in Soundair conflicts with the position I have set out above for two reasons. First, the issue of whether the prospective purchaser had a legal right or interest was not specifically addressed by the court. Indeed, in describing the general principles that govern a sale approval motion, Galligan J.A., for the majority, adopted the approach in Crown Trust v. Rosenberg. Under the heading "Consideration of the interests of all the parties", he referred to the interests of the creditors, the debtor and a purchaser who has negotiated an agreement with the receiver. He did not mention the interests of unsuccessful would be purchasers. Second, the facts in Soundair were unusual. The unsuccessful offeror was a company in which Air Canada had a substantial interest. The order appointing the receiver specifically directed the receiver "to do all things necessary or desirable to complete a sale to Air Canada" and if a sale to Air Canada could not be completed to sell to another party. Arguably, this provision in the order of the court created an interest in Air Canada which could be affected by the sale approval order and which entitled it to standing in the sale approval proceedings.

[29] In limited circumstances, a prospective purchaser may become entitled to participate in a sale approval motion. For that to happen, it must be shown that the prospective purchaser acquired a legal right or interest from the circumstances of a particular sale process and that the nature of the right or interest is such that it could be adversely affected by the approval order. A commercial interest is not sufficient.

[30] There is a sound policy reason for restricting, to the extent possible, the involvement of prospective purchasers in sale approval motions. There is often a measure of urgency to complete court approved sales. This case is a good example. When unsuccessful purchasers become involved, there is a potential for greater delay and additional uncertainty. This potential may, in some situations, create commercial leverage in the hands a disappointed would be purchaser which could be counterproductive to the best interests of those for whose benefit the sale is intended.

[31] In arguing that simply being a prospective purchaser accords a broader right or interest than I have set out above, Bioglan relies on the decision of the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal in Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303 (C.A.). In that case, the receiver invited tenders to purchase lands of the debtor and received three offers. The receiver accepted Cameron's offer and inserted a clause in the sale agreement calling for court approval. On the application to approve the sale, Treby, an unsuccessful bidder, was joined as an intervenor.

Treby opposed approval, arguing that he had been misled into believing that he would have another opportunity to bid on the property. The court directed that all three bidders be given a further opportunity to bid by way of sealed tender. Cameron appealed the order. The tender process proceeded. Treby and the third bidder submitted bids; Cameron did not. The receiver accepted Treby's offer and the court approved the sale to Treby. Cameron also appealed this order and Cameron's two appeals were heard together. Hart J.A. held that both Cameron and Treby had a right to appear at the original hearing because both were parties directly affected by the decision of the court. He concluded that the first decision re-opening the bidding process and the order approving the sale to Treby were both final in their nature in that they amounted to a final determination of the rights of Cameron and Treby. He did not set out specifically what "rights" he was referring to. Having regard to the facts in the case, it is not clear to me that Cameron stands for the proposition asserted by Bioglan, that an unsuccessful would be purchaser, without more, has a right that is finally determined by an order approving a sale. If it does, I would, with respect, disagree.

[32] In the result, I conclude that the fact that Bioglan made an offer to purchase Hyal's assets did not give it a right or interest that was affected by the sale approval order. It was not entitled to standing on the motion on that basis nor is it now entitled to bring this appeal on that basis.

[33] As an alternative, Bioglan relies upon three circumstances in this case, each of which it says, in somewhat different ways, results in it having the right to appeal the sale approval order to this court. First, Bioglan submits that it acquired this necessary right under the provision in the order of September 28 which directed that "no party shall be entitled to retract, withdraw, vary or countermand any offer submitted to the receiver prior to October 29 1999".

[34] Bioglan's offer was, by its terms, to expire on October 4. Bioglan argues that the order of September 28 imposed an obligation on it to keep that offer open until October 29. That being the case, Bioglan maintains that it acquired a right to appear and oppose the motion to approve the sale.

[35] I do not accept this argument. The ordinary meaning of the language in the order did not require Bioglan to extend its outstanding offer. The order did nothing more than preclude parties from taking steps to either amend or withdraw their offers before October 29. By its terms, Bioglan's offer was to expire on October 4. The order of September 28 did not affect the expiry date of the offer.

[36] Even if the language of the September 28 order is interpreted to preclude an existing offer from expiring in accordance with its terms, the result would be the same. Bioglan made its offer to the receiver under terms and conditions of sale approved by the court on August 26. The terms and conditions of the sale were deemed to be part of each offer made to the receiver. Clause 14 of the terms and conditions provided:

No party shall be entitled to retract, withdraw, vary or countermand its offer prior to acceptance or rejection thereof by the vendor (receiver).

(Emphasis added)

[37] The order of September 28 tracks the emphasized language. If the language in the order is interpreted to preclude an existing offer from expiring according to its terms, then when Bioglan submitted its offer it agreed, by virtue of cl. 14 in the terms and conditions of sale, that its offer would remain open until it was either accepted or rejected by the receiver. Assuming this interpretation, the order of September 28 added nothing to the obligation that Bioglan had assumed when it made its offer.

[38] Accordingly I would not give effect to this argument.

[39] Next, Bioglan submits that the order of September 28 created a duty on the receiver to negotiate further with the non-exclusive bidders once it determined that a transaction based on the tax benefits of Hyal's tax loss position could not be structured. This duty, it is argued, created a corresponding legal right in Bioglan to participate further in the process. This right, Bioglan maintains, was violated by the receiver when it recommended the Skyepharma agreement.

[40] I do not read the order of September 28 as imposing this duty on the receiver. The order provided the receiver with a discretion as to whether to negotiate further with the non-exclusive bidders. It did not require the receiver to do so. Moreover, the order of September 28 did not limit the receiver to entering into an agreement with the exclusive bidders only if an agreement could be structured to take advantage of the tax losses. The order of September 28 did not create either the duty or the right asserted by Bioglan.

[41] Finally, Bioglan submits that it acquired the necessary right to bring this appeal because the motions judge permitted it to make submissions on the sale approval motion. Again, I see no merit in this argument. As I have set out above, it seems apparent that the motions judge heard Bioglan's argument solely because it was a creditor of Hyal and not because it was an unsuccessful prospective purchaser. Bioglan does not seek to bring this appeal in its role as a creditor, nor does it complain that the sale approval order is unfair to the creditors of Hyal.

[42] The motions judge approved the sale based on the recommendation of the receiver that it was in the best interests of the creditors. The fact that Bioglan was given an opportunity to be heard in these circumstances did not create a right which would provide standing to bring this appeal. The order sought to be appealed does not finally dispose of any right of Bioglan as creditor.

Disposition

[43] In the result, I would allow the motion and quash the appeal with costs to the moving party.

Order accordingly.

Notes

Note 1: These offers were superior in that they were the only two that attempted to provide value for the tax loss positions of Hyal.

Note 2: The rule as presently worded is not.